

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 3

July 17, 2018

251 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

State v. Jan G., 329 C 465	27
<i>Murder; assault of elderly person third degree; whether defendant was compelled to represent himself without proper waiver of right to counsel; whether defendant continued to be represented by counsel while presenting certain narrative testimony; State v. Francis (317 Conn. 452), distinguished.</i>	
State v. Norman P., 329 C 440	2
<i>Sexual assault in spousal relationship; assault of elderly person second degree; assault of elderly person third degree; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court lacked discretion to decline to mark complainant's privileged counseling center records for identification following that court's determination that defendant failed to make requisite showing to require in camera review of those records; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court improperly declined to conduct in camera review of complainant's privileged counseling center records; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that defendant's entire written statement to police was admissible pursuant to provision (§ 1-5 (b)) of Connecticut Code of Evidence; proper application of § 1-5 (b), discussed.</i>	
State v. Campbell (replacement page), 328C 444	v
State v. Campbell (replacement pages), 328C 451-452	vii
State v. Campbell (replacement pages), 328C 557-558	ix
Volume 329 Cumulative Table of Cases	47

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Bank of America, N.A. v. Kydes, 183 CA 479	161A
<i>Foreclosure; standing; failure to timely answer or object to requests for admission pursuant to rule of practice (§ 13-23 [a]); claim that trial court improperly relied on defendant's admissions as basis for finding that original plaintiff had standing to bring this action and for rendering summary judgment; claim that trial court erred in failing to hold evidentiary hearing on challenge to original plaintiff's standing.</i>	
Clark v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, 183 CA 426.	108A
<i>Administrative appeal; suspension of motor vehicle operator's and commercial driver's licenses by defendant Commissioner of Motor Vehicles; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that there was substantial evidence in record to support finding that there was probable cause that plaintiff operated his motor vehicle while under influence of liquor within two hours preceding his failed blood alcohol content tests; whether inferences underlying commissioner's conclusion that plaintiff was operating his vehicle after certain time were supported by compelling circumstantial evidence in record; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to reargue or for reconsideration; claim that plaintiff received ineffective assistance from counsel at administrative hearing resulting in failure to present additional relevant evidence.</i>	
Conroy v. Idlibi, 183 CA 460	142A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; claim that trial court erred by finding that neither party was at fault for breakdown of marriage; claim that trial court erred by making financial awards favorable to plaintiff; whether trial court's factual finding that neither party bore greater responsibility for breakdown of marriage was clearly</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>erroneous; whether trial court properly considered appropriate statutory factors in making financial awards; whether financial awards were supported by evidence and within parameters of trial court's discretion.</i>	
Comeroli v. Kutz, 183 CA 401	83A
<i>Legal malpractice; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment in favor of defendants on basis of its conclusion that there was insufficient expert testimony on issue of causation; whether Connecticut law generally requires plaintiff in legal malpractice action arising from prior litigation to prove, through expert testimony, that but for alleged breach of duty, it was more likely than not that he would have prevailed in underlying cause of action; reviewability of claim that trial court improperly considered defendants' reply brief, which, contrary to its certification, was not received by plaintiff's counsel prior to morning of hearing on defendants' motion for summary judgment; whether trial court properly permitted defendants to file surreply.</i>	
Handel v. Commissioner of Social Services, 183 CA 392.	74A
<i>Administrative appeal; application for Medicaid benefits; whether defendant's decision was not rendered within ninety days of date that plaintiff requested fair hearing, as required by statute (§§ 17b-60 and 17b-61) and applicable federal regulation (42 C.F.R. § 431.244 [f] [2013]); whether administrative appeal from denial of Medicaid benefits should have been sustained.</i>	
Hum v. Silvester, 183 CA 489	171A
<i>Injunction; whether trial court correctly determined that defendants had prescriptive easement over shared driveway; whether evidence supported court's finding that use of driveway by defendants and their predecessor in title was open, visible, and continuous for more than fifteen years under claim of right; doctrine of tacking, discussed.</i>	
In re James H. (See In re Katherine H.), 183 CA 320	2A
In re Katherine H., 183 CA 320	2A
<i>Child neglect; whether trial court's findings were clearly erroneous; whether trial court abused its discretion in committing children to custody of Commissioner of Children and Families.</i>	
In re Zoey H., 183 CA 327	9A
<i>Motion to revoke commitment; unpreserved claim that trial court violated respondent father's right to procedural due process when it denied motion to revoke commitment of minor child to Commissioner of Children and Families without first conducting hearing to determine father's fitness as parent; whether statute (§ 46b-129 [m]) and rule of practice (§ 35a-14A) pertaining to revocation of commitment of minor child strike appropriate balance between commissioner's and father's interests, and comply with procedural due process requirements; unpreserved claim that § 46b-129 (m), as applied to respondent father, infringed on father's right to substantive due process; claim that father was entitled to presumption of fitness as parent and that court improperly applied burden to father to prove that cause for commitment no longer existed.</i>	

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, Publications Director

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
ERIC M. LEVINE, Reporter of Judicial Decisions
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

St. Juste v. Commissioner of Correction, 183 CA 471	153A
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance in failing to inform petitioner that conviction, pursuant to guilty plea, of assault in second degree would result in certain deportation; whether habeas court properly denied habeas petition; whether petitioner demonstrated that legal advice concerning deportation consequences was constitutionally required under state of law prior to Padilla v. Kentucky (599 U.S. 356); whether petitioner sustained burden of demonstrating that trial counsel's representation was deficient or rendered plea unintelligent or involuntary in constitutional sense.</i>	
State v. Pettipas, 183 CA 442.	124A
<i>Sexual assault in first degree; sexual assault in second degree; sexual assault in fourth degree; unlawful restraint in second degree; risk of injury to child; motion to correct illegal sentence; claim that trial court abused discretion in denying motion to correct illegal sentence; whether sentencing court materially relied on inaccurate information in imposing sentence.</i>	
State v. Taveras, 183 CA 354.	36A
<i>Violation of probation; revocation of probation; whether words defendant used to express frustration with preschool staff member constituted fighting words or true threat under first amendment to United States constitution or under statute proscribing breach of peace in second degree (§ 53a-181 [a] [1] and [3]); claim that there was sufficient evidence to find that defendant committed breach of peace in second degree on basis of nonverbal conduct; whether evidence was sufficient to support claim that trial court reasonably could have inferred that defendant's alleged threat to preschool staff member was component of defendant's nonverbal conduct; whether defendant's statement to preschool staff member, "you better be careful, you better watch yourself," constituted fighting words within meaning of § 53a-181 (a) (1) or (3); whether defendant's statement had tendency to provoke imminent retaliation from average person in staff member's position; whether defendant's statement constituted true threat within meaning of § 53a-181 (a) (3); whether state adduced sufficient evidence to show that reasonable listener would have been highly likely to interpret statement as serious expression of intent to harm or assault staff member.</i>	
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Vollenweider (Memorandum Decision), 183 CA 901.	181A
Zilkha v. Zilkha, 183 CA 452	134A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; guardian ad litem fees; claim that trial court abused its discretion by precluding defendant from presenting certain evidence regarding background of guardian ad litem when trial court determined that such evidence was irrelevant to determining amount and apportionment of guardian's fees pursuant to statute (§ 46b-62); whether trial court correctly exercised its discretion by implementing sliding scale model developed by Judicial Branch pursuant to § 46b-62 and adjusting award upward on basis of delineated factors.</i>	
Volume 183 Cumulative Table of Cases	183A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Connecticut State Dental Commission	1B
---	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Suspension of Attorney	1C
Notice of Application for Reinstatement to the Bar	1C